

talking about. It is larger than the total economy of 166 nations. So this is a major allocation of resources that is going to bind our hands for years to come.

What does the Biden amendment do? The Biden amendment says we are going to pay for this. We are not just going to allocate these resources and add it to the debt of this country, which means our children and our grandchildren are going to have to pay this some time in the future.

We passed a very generous tax reduction program for the top 1 percent of the taxpayers in this country. Now listen to this: Between 2003 and 2010, the top 1 percent of the taxpayers, which have an average income in excess of \$1 million, are going to get \$690 billion in tax relief. Do we understand that?

With the tax reductions that this Congress has passed over the period of the last 2 years, the top 1 percent is going to get \$690 billion. Those are individuals who are making \$1 million or more. That is going to be their savings over the next 7 years, \$690 billion. All the Biden amendment says is rather than \$690, let's make it \$600 billion, in order to make a down payment on paying for the war.

Shared sacrifice, now that is a pretty good American idea. Abraham Lincoln believed in it when he call for an increase in the tax for the wealthiest individuals at the time of the Civil War. We did exactly the same thing at the time of the Spanish-American War. Shared sacrifices across the board, by those who had the highest income. We did it in World War I. We did it in World War II. Why are we not doing it with this?

That is all this amendment is really about, shared sacrifice. To the wealthiest 1 percent of individuals, we are saying when we have American servicemen who are risking their lives every day families being disrupted in terms of the National Guard and the Reserves—you can give up some portion of your \$690 billion tax cut. I met with many from Massachusetts' servicemen who have come back from Iraq and Afghanistan to find their jobs in jeopardy gone because of the state of the economy. Families are separated for a much longer time than they ever expected.

In our State, there are 11 families who have lost a loved one and scores of families with grievously wounded relatives and friends. Why can we not say that we are going to have some shared sacrifice? Instead of the \$690 billion, we will make it just under \$600 billion. That is what this amendment is about.

Finally, it seems to me a powerful enough argument, but listen, when we enacted this tax cut, the administration officials, like Secretary Rumsfeld, were saying, "I do not believe the United States has the responsibility for reconstruction." That was at the time we were passing the tax cut.

We enacted this tax cut when the USAID Administrator Natsios was telling the American people the total U.S.

portion of construction costs would be \$1.7 billion and there are no plans for further on funding after this.

This is \$87 billion on top of the \$78 billion that we have already put up to fund this effort in Iraq. What happened to \$1.7 billion? We enacted this tax cut when Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz was informing the Congress, that we are "dealing with a country that can really finance its own reconstruction and relatively soon." Do not worry about it the cost was what we heard.

As a result of the administration's failure to plan for the true costs of the Iraq operation and its failure to obtain substantial international support, we are now faced with a staggering reconstruction of \$20 billion for Iraq which may be the only first installment. This is only the first installment.

Before the Armed Services Committee, Ambassador Bremer said he expects to be back again. When is it going to end? Ambassador Bremer is now suggesting the total reconstruction costs may ultimately reach \$60 billion. Those are the World Bank estimates. Because of the administration's go-it-alone on Iraq, the costs of that mistake have climbed to over \$120 billion.

Clearly, the circumstances have changed. The administration has grossly underestimated the costs now coming due.

President Bush, Secretary Rumsfeld, and Deputy Secretary Wolfowitz wanted to go to war in the worst way, and they did.

Now the bill is coming due. The Biden amendment is the right way for Congress and the country to pay the bill, and I urge my colleagues to approve this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNNING). The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I rise to address the Biden amendment and make comments regarding it. I rise in opposition to that amendment and I wanted to indicate why.

First, I want to indicate how we got to the point we are today. There were a number of people who came forward to say this is a huge bill—and it is. This is too much. I think we should examine that issue. I hope nobody says we should not be paying, because we have started down this road sometime back and it was the Congress that started down this road, not the administration. It was the Congress that started down this road. I think we now need to see this on through or we could leave the situation that we in the Congress started in a worse position than it was when we got into this in the first place.

This is what I want to point out. Congress passed the Iraq Liberation Act in 1998. This was the vote in the House of Representatives: 360 to 38. The Senate, by unanimous consent, passed this bill, the Iraq Liberation Act.

What did it call for? It called for regime change in Iraq. This was signed

into law by President Clinton. We allocated, authorized, and appropriated \$100 million to spend on this effort of regime change in Iraq. That was to get Saddam Hussein out of Iraq.

He was supporting terrorists, he had used weapons of mass destruction, he wreaked terrorism upon his own people, and he was costing us billions of dollars a year in containment because we had soldiers and airmen stationed in Saudi Arabia, and we were doing regular bombings into Iraq. We were conducting no-fly zones in the north and in the south. We built airbases in Saudi Arabia to be able to move this on forward.

This was an untenable situation. It was bad for the Iraqi people, bad for us, and bad for the region. All the countries in the region had some difficulty or problem, either being attacked, as Kuwait was, launched into, as Saudi Arabia was, threatened, as Jordan had been, at war as Iran. These are the countries, other than Turkey and Syria, that surround Iraq. Most of the countries in the region were saying something needed to be done, but they weren't willing to step forward unless the United States was serious. This was part of our statement that we were serious.

President Bush took this forward after 9/11 when the whole world changed for the United States. We decided after 9/11 that we would no longer wait for the terrorists to gather up steam and build up forces against us and then launch. We were going to go to the terrorists and disrupt them first, rather than wait until they came to our soil so tragically. Thus ensued the war on terrorism in Afghanistan and Iraq.

In Iraq, we had a country that had in the past used chemical weapons against its own people and against the Iranians. That is the fact and that is what we knew and this is where it started, and it started with the Congress.

Now to the issue today of the supplemental and how do we pay for it. I think it would be a terrible mistake for us at this time to raise taxes on the American people, just at the time when we are starting to get the economy recovered and moving again.

Finally, this last quarter we had our best quarter in 2 years, with 3-percent GDP growth. The Gross Domestic Product grew by 3 percent this last quarter. We are finally getting some growth and that growth has to occur and has to build up for us to create jobs. There is a lag between that growth and creating jobs. If we go right now and say to the American people that we are going to raise taxes on you at this point in time, you are going to threaten the very early stages of growth and the creation of jobs which is starting to take place. That is the wrong message to send.

The thing we need to do is keep the growth occurring in this country. You do that by low interest rates and by